

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON 20426

IN REPLY REFER TO:

January 4, 1983

Dear Bill:

I know that you are busy saving the Republic and guarding the ramparts.

But this means that you need some comic relief. So I enclose a little something along that line. It is an industry trade journal's comment on my latest state paper. You may find it amusing.

With every warm good wish for 1983 to you and to Sophia, $% \left(1\right) =\left\{ 1\right\}$

Sincerely,

Borne

Bernard Wexler, Director Office of Opinions and Review

Honorable William J. Casey Director of Central Intelligence Washington, D.C. 20505

O.S. 9 parolle dike to you one of those days. I read some advise - and maybe a little buly. They tallyhere number chara is the FERC is 357-8100.

j

L265

What Gospel Of Matthew And George Bornard Shaw Said About Oil Pipelines

Who says bureaucrets can't spook English? The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's 394-page ruling on the Williams oil pipeline case stands as a unique ing on the writtens on pipeline case stands as a unique piece of government writing—filled with lucid, frequently florid, prose, replote with long excursions into history (the exploits of John D. Rockefeller and muckroker ide (the exploits of John D. Rockefeller and muckreker ida Tarbeil and related tales) and occasional flights into the bitzers. "Endito, clever and ingenious," conceded Commissioner J. David Hughes, who filed the sole distent to the opinion—edding that "there is much inselvancy, undue length...and some sophistry that, for my literary and legal testes, could have been emitted." "It is hard to be sure about these things." the document muscal at one point, trying to duess whether con-

"It is hard to be sure about these things." the document muscd at one point, trying to guess whether comment muscd at one point, trying to guess whether commerce would have benefited had the interestate Commerce Commission regulated oil pipelines more vigorously. "Only fools speak with assurance about how hypothetical historical scenarios would have worked thomselves out, about what North America would be gitted today had the colonists never broken with the Mother Country, about what course American history would have taken had the Republican National Convenwould have taken had the Republican National Convention of 1880 chosen Seward rather than Lincoln, about the precise nature of the foreign policy problems that the United States would be confronting in 1982 had Czer Nicholas II boon born under a luckier star and blossed with more political acumen and had Lanin not abandoned the practice of law in Saint Poteraburg for revolutionary politics, or about what the ultimate structure of the oil business would have been like if John D. Rockefolier had never been born."

FERC's ruling was authored by Bernard Wexler, director of the sgency's Office of Opinions and Reviews. He is an attorney, making all the more remarkable the document's application. is an accorney, making all the more remarkable the docu-ment's sardonic comments about the legal process, "The statutes on which we spend most of our time and energy were carefully designed to close gops in the protective fabric that the states had previously fashioned

lawyers have been unable to dispute it." Woxfor wrote, adding later that "those easilys in logal fiction (that adding later that "these exceys in logic fiction lithet speculate shout Congress" original intent in regulating oil pipelines) will breed more litigation, more opinions, and more law review erticles. That will be good for printers, for producers of paper, for buildors of library theires and, of course, for lawyors. But it is unlikely to add anything to either the sum of lawyors. add anything to either the sum of human knowledge or the general waiting."

the general waiters."

Other readings from Wexler's opus:

""In petroleum economics, as in art and in love,
besuty is in the eye of the beholder. What some find
silluring others find repulsive. That is why rivers of link
have been spilled on the quaetions here precented.
History shows that the salars of this Nisomes of words History shows that the source of this Nisgora of words and numbers is a conflict between big business and amail business. More specifically, what is involved (or what used to be involved) is a collicion batwoon Big Oil and Little Oil."

"Oil pipoline owners have done nicely under the status one. Co their effection for its involved one nicely under the

e "Oil pipoline owners have done nicely under the status quo. So their affection for it is unsurprising. Some may be reminded of Matthew 6:21: "For where your tressure is, there shall your heart be size." This is a factor that should be bome in mind. And we do bose it very much in mind. Business enterprises are not eleamosynary institutions. Not are they supposed to be disinterested servants of the nublic increase. That is our disinterested servents of the public interest. That is our role, not theirs. As George Bernsrd. Shaw once observed, Cynicism, may be a sin. But is rarely mistaken.

The industry is much enamored of the ICC's methodology, which it considers divinely inspired and legally required. So we expect it to applied our decision to stick with the ICC's rate base methodology, it is less likely to be extractio over our views of depreciation and rate of cation. lixely to be ecstatic over our views of depreciation and rate of return...Equal or even greater indignation can be expected from most of the industry's critics. They will undoubtedly censure us for willful failure to see the light of reason and for blind adherence to a mathodology that was flawed from birth, that is a relic of the Paleolithic Age of economic regulation, that should thorsfore have Age of economic requirement, that should therefore heave been ratired for senility, decades ago, and that now belongs in a historical museum of regulatory pathology. "Of course, we think these criticisms mistaken..."

PAF ENERGY DAILY Downley 8, 1982